

Today's Topics:

airport security (3 msgs)
ARRL NR 82: AO-13 CRASH
Field day rules...
Good press for hams (SF earthquake)
Phone Patch Construction question
pro-32
pro-32 scanner
The first commercial transistor (radio)
Third Party Traffic, MM net and BAR
Transistor Trivia

Date: Thu, 2 Nov 89 16:45:50 PST

From: doug@NISD.CAM.UNISYS.COM (Doug Hardie)

Subject: airport security

Someone asked if interference had been verified. Yes I have tested for it and seen it. The problems I saw came from inside the airframe. The airframe is a good shield from outside. However, inside is another story. There are many miles of wire in an aircraft. They are effective antennas at most frequencies. For some reason(not logical), much of the avionics electronics was not designed to filter out noise on the lines. Even the radiated signals from a computer can be detected on the aircraft signal lines, and the 28v power lines. Most of the time the levels are too low to be of concern, but sometimes they are not. I no longer have the tech data available, but the levels that are considered acceptable by the AF are hard to achieve with computers. One box I built met those specs, but was still observable in the cockpit. The pilots let it go since it was "insignificant".

-- Doug WA6VVV

Date: 2 Nov 89 14:31:33 GMT

From: att!tsdiag!ka2qhd!w2vy@ucbvax.Berkeley.EDU (Thomas A Moulton RATS Clifton NJ)

Subject: airport security

I usually just walk through the security check point and drop the HT on the belt that goes through the xray machine. I let them ask the questions.

Only once did I ever get asked anything and that was when I had a couple of mobile rigs in a bag... the mic cords seem to get to them...
(The classic curly wire....)

--

Life is too short to be mad about things.

Thomas A. Moulton, W2VY

Packet: w2vy@kd6th Voice: 145.190 (r)

(201) 478-7919

uucp: rutgers!petsd!tsdiag!ka2qhd!w2vy

Date: Fri, 3 Nov 89 09:55 EST

From: Ed Schwalenberg <Ed@ALDERAAN.SCRC.Symbolics.COM>

Subject: airport security

Date: 2 Nov 89 21:31:11 GMT

From: rochester!ray@pt.cs.cmu.edu (Ray Frank)

Has it ever been verified that radios and hand held scanners, etc have been responsible for some sort of electronic problems aboard an aircraft?

The current rule was instituted after a fatal crash was attributed to the local-oscillator emissions of a passenger's FM radio.

If this is true then how do they get safely over radio and TV towers that are putting out many thousands of watts? An aircraft flies over these all the time at only a few miles distance from them. And radios and scanners and their local oscillators put out only a micro watt or two.

The inverse square law. The amount of power present a few miles from a TV tower is down to the microwatt level.

I once took a computer chess set on a long flight. Could the system clock have wreaked havoc upon this huge jet aircraft's electronics.

<Enter Victor Cifuentes mode>

Quite possibly. Have you measured the emissions from your chess game lately? Are you prepared to certify to the other 200 passengers (and their dependents) that your game cannot possibly interfere with the plane's navigation equipment?

<Exit Victor Cifuentes mode>

This subject gets hashed over about twice a year on this list, and twice a year on the AVIATION mailing list as well. The upshot is that the prohibition makes sense, and (to forestall the other standard part of the argument) the pilot of an airline flight does NOT have the power to grant exceptions: that must come from the airline itself.

Date: 3 Nov 89 02:45:37 GMT

From: n8emr!gws@tut.cis.ohio-state.edu (Gary Sanders)

Subject: ARRL NR 82: AO-13 CRASH

In article <484@idacrd.UUCP> mac@idacrd.UUCP (Robert McGwier) writes:

>From article <1333@n8emr.UUCP>, by gws@n8emr.UUCP (Gary Sanders):

>>

>> REQUESTED NOT TO USE OSCAR 13 UNTIL FURTHER NOTICE. AR

>>

>

>Great care should be taken in posting these announcements. Please look

>at the time/date and request further information before posting. A0-13

>is back in good shape and I have worked several stations on it in the

Glad to see that A0-13 is back up... As far as postings..

many of the ARRL type bulletins from my system are posted automatically,

as soon as they appear on our local PBBS. I usually see them about the

same time you folks do.. If the bulletins come late they get posted

late.. Sorry for any problems.....

--

Gary W. Sanders (gws@n8emr or ...!osu-cis!n8emr!gws), 72277,1325

N8EMR @ W8CQK (ip addr) 44.70.0.1 [Ohio AMPR address coordinator]

HAM/SWL/SCANNER BBS (1200/2400/PEP) 614-457-4227

Date: 2 Nov 89 14:26:44 GMT

From: att!tsdiag!ka2qhd!w2vy@ucbvax.Berkeley.EDU (Thomas A Moulton RATS Clifton NJ)

Subject: Field day rules...

nope, it's not a dup

w

--

Life is too short to be mad about things.

Thomas A. Moulton, W2VY

(201) 478-7919

Packet: w2vy@kd6th Voice: 145.190 (r)

uucp: rutgers!petsd!tsdiag!ka2qhd!w2vy

Date: 2 Nov 89 20:12:29 GMT

From: hpda!hpcupt1!hprnd!pat@ucbvax.Berkeley.EDU (Pat Thaler)

Subject: Good press for hams (SF earthquake)

Sacramento RACES has about 150 members not 35. Over 40 of these participated in earthquake operations in Sacramento and the Bay Area.

Pat Thaler KJ6PU

Date: 3 Nov 89 01:40:30 GMT
From: cs.utexas.edu!uwm.edu!ux1.cso.uiuc.edu!ux1.cso.uiuc.edu!phil@tut.cis.ohio-state.edu
Subject: Phone Patch Construction question

> In article <408@entec.Wichita.NCR.COM> kthompso@entec.Wichita.NCR.COM (Ken Thompson) writes:
> >If simplex autopatches were illegal on 2 meters then access to ANY 2 meter
> >repeater's patch would be illegal for the same reason of remote control.
>
> Yup, that's the truth, unless you are controlling the repeater by
> another legal means. In particular, there must be ANOTHER
> control op (or the same control op with simultaneous access to
> separate legal means of control).

47 CFR 97.205 (e) states: Ancillary functions of a repeater that are available to users on the input channel are not considered remotely controlled functions of the station. Limiting the use of a repeater to only certain user stations is permissible.

Therefore we do not have to involve an auxiliary station when it is a repeater station that is doing the autopatch.

> The legal means of control can be either a control link on
> another band, at or above 220 MHz, or it can be a phone line,
> obviously separate from the line that the patch is on. Note that
> "Automatic Control" of a repeater is not good enough. When the
> repeater is doing a phone patch it isn't in repeater service,
> it's in auxiliary service. And there is no such thing as
> "Automatic Control" for auxiliary service.

Since the rules have been reorganized, and minor changes made, the FCC has effectively now made such autopatches legal when they are part of a repeater.

--Phil Howard, KA9WGN--
<phil@ux1.cso.uiuc.edu>

Date: Thu, 2 Nov 89 09:05:06 EST
From: es!Jay_Appell_office@harvard.harvard.edu
Subject: pro-32

I have a Pro-32 scanner from Radio shack that I would like to modify and

make the scan rate faster. Does anyone have this or other mod information for this product ?

Thanks,

Jay Appell

Please reply to INFO-HAMS or directly at the address below.

uucp: harvard!anvil!es!Jay_Appell_office

Date: Thu, 2 Nov 89 09:09:13 EST
From: es!Jay_Appell_office@harvard.harvard.edu
Subject: pro-32 scanner

I have a Pro-32 scanner from Radio shack that I would like to modify and make the scan rate faster. Does anyone have this or other mod information for this product ?

Thanks,

Jay Appell

Please reply to INFO-HAMS or directly at the address below.

uucp: harvard!anvil!es!Jay_Appell_office

Date: Fri, 3 Nov 89 07:38:26 EST
From: Michael_Edelman%Wayne-MTS@um.cc.umich.edu
Subject: The first commercial transistor (radio)

Re the comment from isw.cup.portal.com:

I believe the first transistor radio sold was a Zenith; it had a clear plastic case and sold for around \$90. 'Course, I've been wrong before...
--mike ke8yy

Date: 3 Nov 89 01:40:23 GMT
From: cs.utexas.edu!uwm.edu!ux1.cso.uiuc.edu!ux1.cso.uiuc.edu!phil@tut.cis.ohio-state.edu

Subject: Third Party Traffic, MM net and BAR

There are new tariff's for the phone line connections to the locals that introduce new charges for those trying to bypass to get into some other phone exchange. Talking to someone somewhere else w/o the phone company being involved at all is ok. But if you enter into the local phone lines at a distant location, the tariff's are calling you a long distance carrier and charging as such. It's not illegal, but you do have to pay more to get the local connection.

Date: 2 Nov 89 16:42:00 GMT
From: att!occrsh!occrsh.ATT.COM!QAOKIS.UUCP!gw1@ucbvax.Berkeley.EDU
Subject: Transistor Trivia

During the fall of 1955, I acquired two CK722 transistors built by Raytheon and used them in a hybrid radio for the audio stages. I also have those transistors. Probably somewhat of a collector's item now.

George Lower - W5TOQ

End of INFO-HAMS Digest V89 Issue #838
